

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12 have been amended. Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Enclosed herewith is Credit Card Form PTO-2038 in the amount of \$102.00 in payment of the fee for the added claims. Please charge any other fees for entry of this Amendment to our deposit account 18-1644.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 1-4 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Takagi, et al. patent. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Ohmori patent and claims 9-11 have also been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Jin patent. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Kawaguchi, et al. reference. Finally, claims 5, 6 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based on the Ohmori patent taken, respectively, with the Hasegawa, et al. patent, the Kamamoto, et al. patent and the Uekane, et al. patent. With respect to applicants' claims, as amended, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended applicants' independent claim 1 and 9 to better define applicant's invention. More particularly, claim 1 is directed to a video camera having an approximately rectangular parallelepiped shape extending longer in a height direction of a body thereof in an image pickup state. The camera includes a display part of an approximately rectangular shape disposed on a side face of the video camera body and having a display plane to display a picked-up image. A moving member is provided for enabling the display part to move between a first position in which the display part makes the picked-up image viewable and a second position in which the display part is stowed in the video camera body. The camera further is defined as when the display part is in the second position, an image pickup optical axis of the video camera body is approximately parallel with the display plane.

and a major-side direction of the display plane coincides with a major-side direction of the video camera body, and when said display part is in the first position, a minor-side direction of the display plane coincides with the major-side direction of the video camera body.

Applicants' amended claim 9 is also directed to a video camera having approximately rectangular parallelepiped shape extending longer in a height direction of a body thereof in an image pickup state. The camera of claim 9 includes a display part of an approximately rectangular shape disposed on a side face of the video camera body to display a picked-up image, with the side face of the video camera body being approximately parallel with an image pickup optical axis of the video camera body. A first member is provided for enabling the display part to rotate around a first shaft approximately parallel with an incident optical axis from a state where a major-side direction of the display part is situated approximately parallel with a major-side direction of the video camera body. A second member is also provided for enabling the display part to rotate around a second shaft perpendicular to the incident optical axis in such a state that the display part has rotated approximately 90 degrees from the state where the major-side direction of the display part is situated approximately parallel with the major-side direction of the video camera body.

The constructions of applicants' amended claims 1 and 9 are not believed to be taught or suggested by the cited art of record. In particular, the Examiner has argued, in applying the Takagi, et al. patent to applicant's claim 1, that the Takagi, et al. patent discloses "a moving member for enabling said display part to move between a first position in which said display part makes the picked-up image viewable and a second position in which said display part is stowed in the video camera body (e.g., Fig. 21, the first position is shown in the figure and the second position is when the display part is aligned with the camera)" In light of this

argument, in the second position of the display part of the camera in the Takagi, et al. patent, i.e., when the display part is aligned with the camera body, the display plane would be perpendicular to the optical axis of the camera body.

Applicants' amended claim 1, however, now recites that in the second position of the display part of the camera the image pickup optical axis of the video camera body is approximately parallel to the display plane, not perpendicular to the display plane, as taught in the Takagi, et al. patent. Applicants' amended claim 1, and its respective dependent claims thus now patentably distinguish over the Takagi, et al. patent.

With respect to the Ohmori patent, the Examiner in applying this patent to applicants' claim 1 states that the patent discloses " a moving member for enabling said display part to move between a first position in which said display part makes the picked-up image viewable and second position in which said display part is stowed in the video camera (e.g., according to the arrangement of Figs. 1 and 2 the display would be able to face inwards and be in a second position or face outward and be in a first position, column 3, lines 52-54)" Accordingly, in the second position of the display in the Ohmori patent, in which the display would face inward, it is evident that the display plane of the display would be perpendicular to the optical axis of the camera body.

This again contrasts with applicants' amended claim 1 which recites that in the second position of the display part of the camera the image pickup optical axis of the video camera body is approximately parallel to the display plane, not perpendicular to the display plane, as taught in the Ohmori patent. Applicant's amended claim 1, and its respective dependent claims, thus now also patentably distinguish over the Ohmori patent.

In applying the Kawaguchi, et al. reference to applicants' claim 1, the Examiner has stated that this reference discloses "a moving member for enabling said display part to move between a first position in which said display part makes the picked-up image viewable and a second position in which said display part is stowed in the video camera body (e.g., according to the arrangement of Fig. 1 the display would be as shown and be in a first position or be closed in a second position)" However, in the first position of the display part as shown in Fig. 1 of this reference, the major side of the display plane of the display part coincides with the major side of the camera body.

Applicants' amended claim 1, on the other hand, recites that when the display part is in the first position, a minor-side direction of the display plane coincides with the major side of the video camera body. Applicants' amended claim 1, and its respective dependent claims, thus now likewise patentably distinguish over the Kawaguchi, et al. reference.

The Examiner has stated, with respect to applicants' claim 9, that the Ohmori patent discloses "a display part of approximately rectangular shape disposed on a side face of the video camera body to display a picked-up image (e.g., element 10 of Fig. 1)" It is evident from the position of the lens 16 in Fig. 1 of the Ohmori patent that the side face of the video camera to which the display part 10 is attached is perpendicular to the optical axis of the camera body 14.

Again, this contrast with applicants' amended claim 9 which now recites that the side face of the video camera body on which the display part is disposed is approximately parallel with the image pickup optical axis of the video camera body. Applicants' amended claim 9, and its respective dependent claims, thus now patentably distinguish over the Ohmori patent.

In citing the Jin patent against applicants' claim 9, the Examiner argues that "Jin discloses a video camera having an approximately rectangular parallelepiped shape extending longer in the height direction of a body thereof in an image pickup state (e.g., See Figs. 4A and 4B)" In a careful reading of the Jin patent, it is apparent that Figs. 4A and 4B show only the top surface of camcorder body 1. Thus, lines 50-54 of column 2 of the patent state, in part, that "FIG 4A is a top view of a camcorder . . . when the LCD viewfinder stands vertically on the upper surface of the camcorder body" Similarly, lines 56-59 of column 2 state, in part, "FIG 4B is a perspective view of a camcorder . . . when the LCD viewfinder stands vertically on the upper surface of the camcorder body"

Accordingly, the Examiner's reliance on FIGS. 4A and 4B of the Jin patent as disclosing "a video camera . . . extending longer in the height direction of a body thereof in an image pickup state" (emphasis added) is misplaced. Moreover, in the Jin patent, the LCD viewfinder is on the upper surface of the camcorder and there is no teaching or suggestion in the patent of a display part disposed on a side face of the video camera body, as recited in applicants' amended claim 9. Amended claim 9, and its dependent claims, thus patentably distinguish over the Jin patent.

The other patents cited by the Examiner, i.e., the Hasegawa, et al. patent, the Kamamoto, et al. patent and the Uekane, et al. patent add nothing to the above discussed patents which would result in applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants added claims 21 and 22 in reciting "a moving member for enabling said display part to move between a first position in which said display part makes the picked-up image viewable and a second position in which a side face of the display part on which the display plane is located comes to abut on the video camera body and said display part is


stowed in the video camera body, wherein, said moving member comprises a first member for enabling said display part to rotate around a first shaft from a state where said display part is first position, and a second member for enabling said display part to rotate around a second shaft different from said first shaft in such a state that said display part has rotated from the state where said display part is first position" are also believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art of record.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 14, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
T: (212) 682-9640


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
Attorney of Record